



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/943,939 | 08/31/2001 | Cedric K. R. H. Bouleau | 2051 | 2051 |

55346 7590 04/19/2007
OSHA . LIANG L.L.P. / SLB
1221 MCKINNEY STREET
SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2179

| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|--|------------|---------------|
| 3 MONTHS | 04/19/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/943,939

Applicant(s)

BOULEAU, CEDRIC K. R. H.

Examiner

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,7,9,11-15,18-21,24-30,33-36 and 39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6-7, 9, 11-15, 18-21, 24-30, 33-36 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 01/22/07 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 6-7, 9, 11-15, 18-21, 24-30, 33-36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carroll [US. 2002/0085020] in view of Khalfay et al. [US. 7,039,875].

As per independent claims 1, 18, 27 and 33, Carroll teaches a computer implemented method and corresponding system for providing a dynamically modifiable user interface comprising the steps/means:
a memory configured to store a UI view definition for the user interface (page 1, 0017-0021); and

a processor configured to execute a UI view manager (page 3, 0054-0055, Web browser is considered as the first application), wherein the UI view manager comprising functionality to dynamically generate at run-time the user interface from the UI view definition (page 5, (0167) and page 7, (2 121), wherein the UI view manager instantiates, as part of the user interface, (page 3, (0059) and page 5, (0189)), (page 7, (0212) and page 9, (0243)).

Carroll also teaches the wrapped control comprising a control (page 1, 0061, Java application is considered as the second application) and a wrapper (page 7, (0214) and page 3, (0059); wherein each wrapper provides an interface between the control and the UI view manager (page 12, (0256) –page 13, (0263) wherein each control comprises an application, wherein each application generates a graphical output and wherein the output of each control is displayed, using the UI view manager, in the one of the plurality of panels in which the control is located (Java application and browser are two currently executing applications).

Carroll fail to clearly teach the plurality of panels and the UI view definition specifying a layout of a plurality of panels in the user interface; the plurality of panels, each of the plurality of panels comprising a wrapped control.

However, Khalfay et al. teach the plurality of panels (column 1, lines 59-67 and column 2, lines 25-65); the UI view definition specifying a layout of a plurality of panels (figures 2-3); and the plurality of panels, each of the plurality of panels comprising a wrapped control (column 5, line 60 through column 6, line 50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of plurality of panels of Khalfay with the Carroll's system. The motivation would have been to enhance the GUI for those who might need.

As per claims 6, 20, 29 and 35, Carroll teaches the UI view manager being operable to dynamically change at a run-time a function of at least one of the wrapped control (page 9, (0244)).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent in Carroll's system to comprise a UI container, wherein the user interface is provided within an environment provided by the UI container.

As per claim 9, which is dependent on of claim 1, Carroll teaches the UI view manager instantiates at least one of the wrapped controls as part of the user interface by:

providing functionality of the at least wrapped control to be performed in response to activating a user interface element of the at least wrapped control in the user interface (page 7, (0210) and page 12, (0256) - page 13, (0263).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Carroll teaches the UI view manager containing an implementation of a UI view interface and the at least one of the wrapped control invokes function of the UI view interface implementation of the UI view interface to communicate with the UI view manager (page 7, (0210) and page 12, (0256) - page 13, (0263)).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Carroll teaches the UI view manager being operable to dynamically generate the user interface in response to a change to the UI view definition (page 14, (0268)).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 1, Carroll teaches:
a user interface designer for providing a UI view definition (page 8, (0236)).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 1, Carroll teaches the UI view definition corresponding to an XML file (fig. 17).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 1, Carroll teaches the UI view definition comprising a control definition for the wrapped control, wherein the control definition specifies a user interface element of the wrapped control and a program identifier of code to provide functionality of the wrapped control (page 9, (0243) and (0244)).

As per claims 19, 28 and 34, Carroll teaches the UI view manager being operable to dynamically add a new wrapped control to the user interface (page 7, (0212) and page 9, (0243)).

As per claims 21, 30 and 36, Carroll teaches the user interface including a plurality of controls (e.g. fig. 19); and it is inherent in Carroll system that the UI view manager is operable to dynamically remove an existing control of the controls from the user interface using the GUI builder application (fig. 22).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 18, Carroll teaches creating a wrapper comprising implementing at least one function of a control interface (page 9, (0244)).

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 24, Carroll teaches the at least one function is selected from a group consisting of a first function to cause at least one of the controls to read its internal data, a second function to cause the control to load a property of the control from the UI view definition, a third function to save a property of the control to the UI view definition, a fourth function to return a license key for the control, a fifth function to initialize a property of the control and a sixth function to receive a notification about a user interface event (fig. 13; pages 7 and 8, (0214)). Carroll fail to clearly teach the plurality of panels and the UI view definition specifying a layout of a plurality of panels in the user interface; the plurality of panels, each of the plurality of panels comprising a wrapped control.

However, Khalfay et al. teach the plurality of panels (column 1, lines 59-67 and column 2, lines 25-65); the UI view definition specifying a layout of a plurality of panels (figures 2-3); and the plurality of panels, each of the plurality of panels comprising a wrapped control (column 5, line 60 through column 6, line 50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of plurality of panels of Khalfay with the Carrol's system. The motivation would have been to enhance the GUI for those who might need.

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 18, Carroll teaches: generating a UI view manager by implementing at least one function of an UI view interface the function selected from the set a first function returning a table

of references to business objects, a second function returning a parameter to provide scope of access to a control of the user interface, a third function to register a control for providing alarm information to the control, a fourth function to deregister a control to terminate providing alarm information to the control, a fifth function to create a panel for housing controls, a sixth function to create a panel for adding a control to a panel (page 13, (0264)), a seventh function to remove the panel from the user interface, an eighth function to remove a control from a panel, a ninth function to activate or deactivate a control, a tenth function to display a text message of a control on a status message panel (page 6, 0203-0209). Carroll fail to clearly teach the plurality of panels and the UI view definition specifying a layout of a plurality of panels in the user interface; the plurality of panels, each of the plurality of panels comprising a wrapped control. However, Khalfay et al. teach the plurality of panels (column 1, lines 59-67 and column 2, lines 25-65); the UI view definition specifying a layout of a plurality of panels (figures 2-3); and the plurality of panels, each of the plurality of panels comprising a wrapped control (column 5, line 60 through column 6, line 50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of plurality of panels of Khalfay with the Carroll's system. The motivation would have been to enhance the GUI for those who might need.

As per independent claim 39, it is a combination of claims 1 and 12; therefore, it is rejected as set for in the rejection of claims 1 and 12, combined.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respects to claims 1, 6-7, 9, 11-15, 18-21, 24-30, 33-36 and 39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4141.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo, can be reached at 571-272-4847.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mylinh Tran



WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER